IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

EDWARD F. PLASTINO and SECOND AMENDMENT FOUNDATION, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No. 4:12-CV-01316-CAS

CHRIS KOSTER, in his Official Capacity as Attorney General of the State of Missouri, and TOM NEER, in his Official Capacity as Sheriff of St. Charles County, Missouri,

Defendants.

<u>DEFENDANT TOM NEER'S ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO AMENDED</u> <u>COMPLAINT</u>

COMES NOW Defendant Tom Neer in his official capacity as Sheriff of St. Charles County, Missouri, and for his Answer and Affirmative Defenses to Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, Doc. #19, states as follows:

INTRODUCTION

- 1. Paragraph 1 states the nature of the Amended Complaint and requires no answer.
- 2. Paragraph 2 states a conclusion of law to which no answer is required.
- 3. Paragraph 3 states a conclusion of law to which no answer is required. To the extent that Paragraph 3 contains allegations of fact, Defendant denies the same.
- 4. Paragraph 4 states the relief sought by Plaintiffs and a conclusion of law and requires no answer.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. Paragraph 5 states a conclusion of law to which no answer is required. To the extent that Paragraph 5 contains allegations of fact, Defendant denies the same.
- 6. Paragraph 6 states a conclusion of law to which no answer is required. To the extent that Paragraph 6 contains allegations of fact, Defendant denies the same.
- 7. Paragraph 7 states a conclusion of law to which no answer is required. To the extent that Paragraph 7 contains allegations of fact, Defendant denies the same.

PLAINTIFFS

- 8. Defendant is without sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 8 and therefore denies same.
- 9. Defendant is without sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 9 and therefore denies same.
- 10. Paragraph 10 states a conclusion of law to which no answer is required. To the extent that Paragraph 10 contains allegations of fact, Defendant denies the same.
 - 11. Defendant admits the allegations of Paragraph 11.
- 12. Defendant is without sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 12 and therefore denies same.
- 13. Defendant is without sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 13 and therefore denies same.
- 14. Defendant is without sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 14 and therefore denies same.
- 15. Defendant is without sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 15 and therefore denies same.

- 16. Admitted that Chris Koster is the Attorney General of the State of Missouri. The remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 16 state conclusions of law to which no answer is required. To the extent that Paragraph 16 contains other allegations of fact, Defendant denies the same.
- 17. Admitted that Defendant Tom Neer is the Sheriff of St. Charles County, Missouri, and that he is the authority charged with processing and issuing concealed carry applications and permits in St. Charles County. The remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 17 state conclusions of law to which no answer is required. To the extent that Paragraph 17 contains other allegations of fact, Defendant denies the same.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

- 18. Defendant admits that the Second Amendment reads as set forth in Paragraph 18.
- 19. Paragraph 19 states a conclusion of law to which no answer is required.

STATE LAW

- 20. Defendant admits that Section 571.101.2(1), RSMo, reads as set forth in Paragraph 20.
- 21. Defendant admits that Section 571.030.1(1), RSMo, reads as set forth in Paragraph 21.
- 22. Defendant admits that Section 571.030.7, RSMo, reads as set forth in Paragraph 22.
- 23. Defendant admits that Section 558.011.1(4), RSMo, reads as set forth in Paragraph 23.

COUNT I – VIOLATION OF EQUAL PROTECTION

- 24. Defendant's answers to Paragraphs 1 through 23 are realleged and incorporated herein by reference.
 - 25. Denied.

COUNT II – VIOLATION OF RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR FIREARMS

- 26. Defendant's answers to Paragraphs 1 through 25 are realleged and incorporated herein by reference.
 - 27. Denied.

COUNT III – FEDERAL PREEMPTION

- 28. Defendant's answers to Paragraphs 1 through 27 are realleged and incorporated herein by reference.
 - 29. Denied.
 - 30. Denied.

FOR ALL COUNTS

- 31. Defendant's answers to Paragraphs 1 through 30 are realleged and incorporated herein by reference.
 - 32. Paragraph 32 states a conclusion of law to which no answer is required.
 - 33. Paragraph 33 states a conclusion of law to which no answer is required.
 - 34. Paragraph 34 states a conclusion of law to which no answer is required.
 - 35. Paragraph 35 states the relief sought by Plaintiffs and requires no answer.
- 36. Paragraph 36 states a conclusion of law to which no answer is required. To the extent that Paragraph 36 contains allegations of fact, Defendant denies the same.
 - 37. Denied.

Case: 4:12-cv-01316-CAS Doc. #: 20 Filed: 10/29/12 Page: 5 of 6 PageID #: 74

38. Paragraph 38 states a conclusion of law to which no answer is required. To the

extent that Paragraph 38 contains allegations of fact, Defendant denies the same.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

1. Plaintiffs fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted against

Defendant Sheriff Neer: (1) for violation of Equal Protection; (2) for violation of the Second

Amendment as it does not apply to or otherwise authorize the carrying of concealed weapons; or

(3) for federal preemption in that no federal immigration law preempts the regulation by the

State of Missouri of the carrying of concealed weapons.

2. Plaintiff Plastino has failed to exhaust his available state remedies by utilizing the

concealed carry permit application denial appeal process of Section 571.114, RSMo, prior to

filing his Complaint.

3. Plaintiff Second Amendment Foundation, Inc., lacks standing against Sheriff

Neer.

Wherefore, Defendant Sheriff Tom Neer having fully answered, Defendant prays that this

Court dismiss the Amended Complaint and grant him his attorney's fees and costs.

OFFICE OF THE ST. CHARLES COUNTY COUNSELOR

/s/ Robert E. Hoeynck
Robert E. Hoeynck #39435MO

/s/ Toby J. Dible

Toby J. Dible #62727MO

Assistant County Counselors 100 North Third Street, Suite 216

St. Charles, Missouri 63301

Tel: 636-949-7540

Fax: 636-949-7541

RHoeynck@sccmo.org TDible@sccmo.org

Attorneys for Defendant Tom Neer

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 29th day of October, 2012, a true copy of the foregoing was delivered through the Court's electronic filing system, according to the information available on the system at the time of filing, or sent directly by e-mail, to the following:

David G. Sigale LAW FIRM OF DAVID G. SIGALE, P.C. 739 Roosevelt Road, Suite 304 Glen Ellyn, Illinois 60137 dsigale@sigalelaw.com

Matthew T. Singer
THE LAW OFFICE OF MATTHEW T. SINGER
6963 Waterman Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
MTSinger@MTSinger.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Andrew M. Hartnett, Chief of Staff John R. Phillips, Assistant Attorney General P.O. Box 899 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

Attorneys for Defendant Chris Koster

/s/ Robert E. Hoeynck
Robert E. Hoeynck